DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 290 EC 201 753

AUTHOR Yanito, Trenly; And Others
TITLE Teacher Attitudes toward Mainstreaming: A Literature Review.
PUB DATE 24 Aug 87
NOTE 28p.; In: Striefel, Sebastian and Others; Grouping Handicapped and Non-Handicapped Children in Mainstream Settings. The Functional Mainstreaming for Success (FMS) Project. Final Report-Part 3; see EC 201 748.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Knowledge Level; *Mainstreaming; *Needs Assessment; Preschool Education; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The paper is a product of the 3-year project, "Functional Mainstreaming for Success," designed to develop a model for instructional mainstreaming of handicapped children (3-6 years old) in community settings. The literature review on teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming stresses implication of these attitudes for successful mainstreaming, and methods for improving teacher attitudes. The review is organized into sections on: attitude assessment (including issues, attitude questionnaires, and direct observation of attitudes); the need to review teacher attitudes; and modification of teacher attitudes. The section on attitude modification considers the following topics: teacher knowledge needs concerning laws and rights, teacher knowledge needs concerning handicapping conditions, teachers' need to understand the mainstreaming process, teacher training needs, teacher incentives for mainstreaming, student characteristics and teacher attitudes, and support services and technical assistance. The paper concludes that a procedure for matching the child's skill level to a teacher's expectations is a critical need if mainstreaming of children with handicaps is to be successful. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290290

~~Goal 1~~
File Name: Teach-Atti.1
Draft 12
January 7, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINSTREAMING:

A LITERATURE REVIEW

Trenly Yanito
Maria C. Quintero
John Killoran
Sebastian Striefel

Utah State University

EC201753

Running Head: TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINSTREAMING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Teacher Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming:
A Literature Review

Federal legislation mandating the education of children with handicaps in least restrictive educational settings (PL 94-142, 1975; PL 99-457, 1986) have created a need to prepare teachers for the arrival of these children their classroom. This need stems from the knowledge that the success of the process called mainstreaming is critically dependent upon the attitudes and expectations which teachers have toward mainstreaming and toward children with handicaps (Brophy & Everton, 1982; Gottlieb & Harper, 1967; Pasanella & Volkmor, 1981; Schwartz, 1984; Thompson & Morgan, 1980; Walker, 1983). The interactions between a child's skills and the receiving teacher's attitudes and expectations can determine the success of mainstreaming for the student, teacher, non-handicapped peers, and parents. In this paper, the authors review research literature on teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming, the implication of these attitudes for successful mainstreaming, and methods for impacting in a positive direction the attitudes of teachers toward mainstreaming and toward children with handicaps.

Attitude Assessment

Issues in Attitude Assessment

Before considering methods for modifying teacher attitudes, these attitudes and expectations must be measured accurately. Teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and persons with handicaps have most frequently been assessed through questionnaires or through direct observation. Methods for assessing teacher attitudes and expectations have been mostly limited to paper and pencil measures (Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Salend & Johns, 1983).

However, the validity of this method of assessment is questionable. A discrepancy often exists between a teacher's expressed behavior and observed behavior (Salend & Johns, 1983). An alternative measure, direct observation of teacher behavior, has also been reported in the literature (Salend & Johns, 1983; Thompson & Morgan, 1980). Although this method seems more appropriate than verbal reports, studies utilizing this method are rare. The use of both methods are reviewed in this section.

Attitudes Assessed On Questionnaires

The most commonly used measure of teacher attitudes is the written questionnaire (Hannah & Pilner, 1983). Carefully constructed questionnaires can provide quick, unobtrusive measures of self-reported attitudes and of expectations about mainstreaming and about the child with handicaps. Additionally, questionnaires can provide teachers with a means of pinpointing, in writing, those areas where support services and technical assistance are needed.

The validity of written questionnaires has been questioned, however. Hannah and Pilner (1983) point out that most questionnaires tend to measure the affective component of a teacher's attitude, i.e., feelings of like or dislike about a subject. This self-report assessment is used to make an extrapolation of how a teacher may act in a real situation. Salend and Johns (1983) report that there are often differences between a teacher's expressed attitude and his or her action as observed by others. The discrepancy between expressed behavior and observed behavior can be deleterious to successful mainstreaming if only self-report data are taken

into consideration when determining how well-suited a particular teacher may be for mainstreaming (Salend & Johns, 1983).

Some instruments reported in the literature which have been used to assess teacher attitudes are listed in Table 1. Information for each instrument includes: purpose, description, the population each instrument is intended to reach, strengths, and weaknesses. Unfortunately, little descriptive information is included in most articles about the instruments used. For example, most studies fail to provide examples of questions to acquaint the reader with the demands, wordings, and definitions of the scale. It is advisable that future studies include such sample questions to help a reader assess which instrument is most appropriate for a specific purpose or population. Without sample questions, the reader cannot determine which instrument may best answer his/her questions.

Another weakness in available instruments is the reliance upon labels to identify certain handicaps (Gajar, 1983; Hannah & Pilner, 1983). The use of labels, or categories of exceptionality, such as mentally retarded, handicapped, or physically disabled, raises the issue that the readers in a population may have multiple interpretations for the same handicap. Multiple interpretations of labels occurs when teachers attribute different characteristics to a label (Hannah & Pilner, 1983). For example, one teacher reacting to the term, physically handicapped, may envision a child who is helpless; whereas, another teacher may think of a child with physical handicaps as a person in a wheelchair, who demonstrates normal intelligence. Other teachers may be unsure about the meaning of a label. These types of situations can confound results in attitude assessment.

The use of labels on instruments has been further criticized because labels are associated with preconceived notions about behaviors and characteristics which can often lead to negative attitudes (Gajar, 1983). Hannah and Pilner (1983) found that children with emotional disturbances were viewed by teachers as unmotivated to learn, unfriendly, dishonest, and aggressive. Children with learning disabilities were viewed by teachers as aggressive, disruptive, academically low functioning, and angry. These assigned negative attributes can carry over into classroom interaction between teachers and mainstreamed students. Brophy and Good (1970) concluded from their research on communication of teacher expectations that students perceived by teachers as high achievers received more positive attention, while students perceived a low achievers receive more negative attention. Children with handicaps receive the similar negative attention as well as decreased cueing, prompting, praising and reinforcing. Such teacher behavior can create a self-fulfilling prophecy for children with handicaps, who themselves may already feel that they do not belong in a mainstream setting (Hersh & Walker, 1983; Walker, McConnell & Clarke, 1983). The student who is already functioning below peers and receives negative attention or decreased _____, praise and reinforcement from a teacher, has an increased chance of failure in the mainstream.

Hannah and Pilner (1983) assessed the reactions of teachers to a list of handicapping conditions using the Semantic Differential Paradigm. The first group of teachers reacted favorably to the learning disabled and the educationally handicapped labels, while the second group reacted more favorably to the labels of blind and deaf. With use of the Personal

Attributes Inventory, the same authors found that one group of teachers reacted more favorably to the label of physically handicapped than to the labels of mentally retarded and learning disabled, while a second group reacted most negatively to the labels mentally retarded and severe and profound. The range of reactions to these labels reiterates the problem of multiple interpretations of handicapping labels.

The problem of multiple interpretations of handicapping labels can be alleviated by providing specific descriptions of the behaviors and characteristics of persons with handicaps, rather than referring to a group of persons by a handicapping condition. Antonak (1980) examined the reactions of university graduate students to the integration of persons with handicaps in both schools and the community. Exceptionalities were operationally defined by the authors, (but unfortunately, the definitions were omitted from the article). Children who were described as normal and gifted were rated most likely to lead their adult lives in a least restrictive community setting, and children described as normal were rated most likely to be educated in a regular classroom. Children described as communicatively disordered and learning disabled were most favored for leading their adult lives in a least restrictive community setting, and children described as physically disabled and communication disordered were most favored for being educated in a regular classroom. The use of labels with accompanying descriptions decreases the chance for multiple interpretation, but the likelihood remains that teachers will continue to associate different behaviors and characteristics with a label based upon prior experience and exposure to a limited number of students with

handicaps, unless specifically trained to recognize handicapping conditions and characteristics associated with each (Donaldson, 1980; Naor & Melgram, 1980; Stephens & Braun, 1980).

Attitudes Assessed Through Direct Observation

Observation studies may be a more appropriate method for assessing teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and toward people who are handicapped. With a reliable method for unobtrusively collecting data, a teacher's actual behavior and interactions with a mainstreamed child can be recorded. Interventions need to focus on appropriate changes in teacher behavior if mainstreaming efforts are to be successful. One limitation of direct observations of course, is that the person being observed may alter his or her behavior during the observation period. However, one is more likely to observe samples of true behavior over periodic observations, than by relying solely on questionnaire data.

While the majority of studies have used questionnaires for assessment of attitudes, two studies are notable in the use of observation methods to assess teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming (Salend & Johns, 1983; Thompson & Morgan, 1980). In one study (Salend & Johns, 1983), the behaviors of two teachers were observed over a 17-week period as they worked with one child labelled as emotionally disturbed. Initial behavior samples were obtained from statements made by the teacher in the child's records, verbal comments made about the child, and about mainstreaming to other school personnel, and professional interactions with peers and placement teams. Initially, teacher comments expressed frustrations in dealing with inappropriate behaviors and unsuccessful instruction approaches. After a

17-week period of intervention that included a behavior change program targeted at decreasing the inappropriate behaviors of the child and increasing desirable classroom behaviors, positive changes in the student and teachers were found. Positive changes in the student included a decrease in the number of tantrums and an improvement in social relationships. Positive changes in teachers included an increase in positive descriptions of the student, comments in support of mainstreaming, and comments reflecting acceptance of the student as normal. As the student's inappropriate behaviors decreased and positive participation in classroom activities increased, teacher comments and descriptions of the student reflected a more positive attitude. Teacher attitudes improved as a result of their increased confidence in teaching the child. With support services from the school counselor and technical assistance in implementing a contingency reinforcement-behavior change program, the teachers received the training needed to better prepare them for teaching a mainstreamed child with emotionally disturbing behavior.

Interaction patterns between teacher and students were also directly observed in mainstream classrooms by Thompson and Morgan (1980). The Brophy-Good Teacher Dyadic Interaction System was used to collect data on interaction patterns between teachers and students in groups of students classified as high-achievers, low-achievers, learning disabled, and behaviorally handicapped. Significant differences were found among teacher interaction patterns with the four groups of students. Teacher-student interaction and teacher feedback occurred most often with the students labelled behaviorally handicapped. The authors suggested from this finding

that teachers were attending more often to inappropriate behaviors, thus reaffirming the need for teacher training in behavior management and serving the needs of children with handicaps.

In summary, it is recommended that when assessing teacher attitudes and expectations for mainstreaming children with handicaps, a method for assessment be employed that is reliable and valid. In using written self-reports, definitions of handicapping conditions would clarify questions for respondents. However, it appears that a naturalistic observation method is the best data system for assessing a true picture of teacher behavior.

The Need to Review Teacher Attitudes

In 1979, Semmel, Gottlieb, & Robinson reviewed the attitudes of professionals toward mainstreaming, and found that teachers and principals generally held a pessimistic attitude toward mainstreaming. The findings were partially attributed to the fact that mainstreaming was relatively new (most studies reviewed by the authors were prior to 1976), and could reflect concern over a novel activity.

A second review was conducted by Jones, Jamieson, Moulin & Towner (1981), in which research methodologies in attitude studies were soundly criticized for lack of validity, contamination of pre-training measures, and inappropriate data collection and analysis procedures. Jones et al, (1981) could not make specific conclusions about teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming because of the confounding variables across the studies reviewed; however, they offered guidelines for attitude-change programs. These guidelines emphasized interpersonal and communication factors that teachers and teacher trainers could develop to work on the exchange of

accurate messages, which was indicated as critical in the formation and change of attitudes.

The discussion which follows is based upon the premise that mainstreaming often does not occur because the adults involved, most often teaching personnel, are not totally supportive of mainstreaming. In keeping with common terminology, this support or its absence, will be referred to as a positive or negative attitude, respectively. Specific observations and recommendations are also provided to address a number of obstacles to attitude change.

Modifying Teacher Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming

Research evidence indicates that teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and toward children with handicaps can be modified (Alexander & Strain, 1978; Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Hersch & Walker, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Lombardi, Meadowcroft, & Strasburger, 1982; Reynolds, Martin-Reynolds, & Mark, 1981; Ringlaben & Price, 1981; Stainback & Stainback, 1981; Thompson & Morgan, 1980; Reynolds). However, one must first identify the factors which affect attitudes. The unwillingness of some teachers to accept children with handicaps into the regular classroom, can result from several factors. These factors include: a) teachers' lack of knowledge about the laws protecting people with handicaps (Lombardi, Meadowcroft & Strasburger, 1982; Ringlaben & Price, 1981); b) lack of knowledge about handicapping conditions (Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Lombardi, Meadowcroft & Strasburger, 1982; Ringlaben & Price, 1981; Schleifer & Klein, 1978); c) lack of understanding about the mainstreaming process (Ringlaben & Price, 1981); d) lack of training to teach the mainstreamed child (Child, 1981; Hersh &

Walker, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978; Stainback & Stainback, 1982); e) lack of incentive by school districts for teachers to accept such children (Schwartz, 1984); f) characteristics of children with handicaps, which may affect attitudes (Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978); and g) the amount of support services and technical assistance available for the mainstreaming teacher (Cohen, 1983; Donaldson, 1980; Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Lombardi, Meadowcroft & Strasburger, 1982; Rule, Killoran, Stowitschek, Innocenti, Striefel & Boswell, 1982). A teacher whose preparation addresses all of these areas has an increased likelihood of success in teaching the mainstreamed child. These areas will be reviewed individually.

Teacher Knowledge Needs: Laws and Rights

One way in which teachers become supportive of mainstreaming is through education to increase teachers' knowledge of the laws and rights protecting people with handicaps. Haisley & Gilberts (1978) have developed a knowledge-based checklist that identifies 10 facets of P.L. 94-142 that teachers need to know if the law is to be implemented in a positive and realistic manner. These 10 facets include: 1) laws regarding the handicapped, 2) handicapping conditions, 3) terminology and definitions of mainstreaming that appear in P.L. 94-142, 4) understanding of appropriate instructional settings for children with handicaps, 5) child evaluation procedures, 6) procedural safeguards, 7) IEP development and implementation, 8) state and local guidelines for implementing 94-142, 9) least restrictive placement possibilities, and 10) related services and their availability.

Methods for updating what teachers need to know about P.L. 94-142 include inservice workshops and coursework. Although these methods for developing teacher knowledge are often implemented for teachers already in the school system, the adequacy of such programs is questionable (Powers, 1983). Teachers at the pre-service level also need exposure to mainstreaming, and the implementation of P.L. 94-142. It is recommended that college faculty, regular and special education teachers, and pre-service teachers receive or continue to receive training on P. L. 94-142 with emphasis on its application in mainstreaming.

Teacher Knowledge Needs: Understanding Handicapping Conditions

One way in which teachers become supportive of mainstreaming is by increasing their knowledge of handicapping conditions through formal instruction. Stephens and Braun (1980) assessed teacher knowledge of handicapping conditions by the number of special education classes which a teacher had taken. They concluded that teachers who had taken a greater number of special education classes indicated a greater willingness to accept placement of a child with handicaps in their regular classrooms. This finding resulted in a suggestion that the number of special education classes required of preservice teachers be increased to include knowledge of mainstreaming, assessment techniques, and communication/consultation skills (Naor & Milgram, 1980; Stephens & Braun, 1980), and that additional coursework for practicing teachers be provided as an effective method of intervention to offset lack of teacher knowledge about handicapping conditions, and to increase the willingness of teachers to accept a child with handicaps into their classrooms (Alexander & Strain, 1978; Ringlaben &

Price, 1981; Warger & Trippe, 1982). Donaldson (1980) added that course instruction should include the dissemination of information, exposure to handicapping conditions through media services and disability simulations, and carefully planned discussions based on information rather than biased opinion and emotion.

Teachers' Need to Understand the Mainstreaming Process

The idea of mainstreaming children with handicaps into regular classrooms frightens many regular educators. These fears can stem from a lack of understanding about the mainstreaming process; i.e., what mainstreaming means and how it can be implemented. Some teachers envision mainstreaming as a wholesale return of all children with handicaps from special education to regular classes. They fear that these children will be placed all day in their classes, and that essential support services will be limited. Teachers must be educated to view mainstreaming a continuing process rather than a discrete event (Guralnick, 1983). Mainstreaming is the instructional and social integration of children who have handicaps into educational and community environments with children who do not have handicaps (Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard, & Kuker, 1975; Nash & Boileau, 1980; Pasanella & Volkmor, 1981; Peterson, 1983; Reyolds & Birch, 1982; Stremel-Campbell, Moore, Johnson-Dorn, Clark & Toews, 1983; Turnbull & Schultz, 1977; Weisenstein & Pelz, 1986; Zigmond & Sansone, 1981). Successful mainstreaming must:

1. Be based on the decision of the IEP team that a child can potentially benefit from placement with children who are not handicapped (Brown, Falvey, Vincent, Kaye, Johnson, Ferrara-Parrish, & Gruenewald, 1980;

Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Nash & Boileau, 1980; Weinstein & Pelz, 1986; Wilcox & Bellamy, 1982);

2. Provide a continuum of least restrictive placement options which range from brief periods of limited interactions, to full-time participation in regular classrooms (Deno, 1973; Price & Weinberg, 1982; Nash & Boileau, 1980; Reynolds and Birch, 1982; Thompson & Arkell, 1980; Weisenstein & Pelz, 1986);
3. Specify the responsibility of students, parents, regular and special education teachers, administrators, and support personnel (Cansler & Winton, 1983; Hughes & Hurth, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 1986; Pasanella & Volkmor, 1982; Peterson, 1983; Powers, 1983; Taylor, 1982; Weisenstein & Pelz, 1986; Zigmond & Sansone, 1981);
4. Include pre-placement preparation, post-placement support, and continued training for students with and without handicaps, their parents, teachers, administrators, and support personnel (Cansler & Winton, 1983; Donaldson, 1980; Guralnick, 1983; Hughes & Hurth, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Peterson, 1983; Powers, 1983; Nash & Boileau, 1980; Reynolds & Birch, 1982; Schwartz, 1984; Taylor, 1982; Thompson & Arkell, 1980; Zigmond & Sansone, 1981);
5. Maximize appropriate interactions between children with and without handicaps through structured activities (such as peer tutoring or buddy systems) and social skills training, as appropriate to specific situations and abilities (Arick, Almond, Young, & Krug, 1983; Gresham, 1981; Hughes & Hurth, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Madden & Slavin, 1983; Reynolds & Birch, 1982; Schwartz, 1984; Stainback & Stainback,

1981; Stainback, Stainback, & Jaben, 1981; Taylor, 1982; Voeltz, Keshi, Brown & Kube, 1980; Walker, 1983; Weisenstein & Pelz, 1986);

6. Provide functional, age-appropriate activities that prepare the child with handicaps to function in current and future community environments (Brown, Nietupski, Hamre-Nietupski, 1976; Brown, et al, 1980; Wilcox & Bellamy, 1982; Wilcox, McDonnell, Rose & Bellamy, 1983); and
7. Occur without major long-term disruption of ongoing educational activities or other detriments to children with and without handicaps in the mainstream setting (Cooke, Ruskus, Appolonia & Peck, 1981; Hamline, 1985; Price & Weinberg, 1982; Vergon & Ross, 1981).

It is recommended that this definition of mainstreaming be communicated to regular educators before decisions are reached to mainstream handicapped children who have handicaps. It is speculated that if teachers are provided with a knowledge base of what mainstreaming is and is not, and how it can be implemented successfully, then teachers will become more receptive toward mainstreaming.

Teacher Training Needs

The majority of regular class teachers believe themselves to be poorly equipped for working with students with handicaps. In one study, 85% of a group of teachers expressed that they lacked the necessary skills for teaching children with handicaps (Crisci, 1981). Training needs for teachers include individualized instruction, interpretation of test results, remediation of instructional deficits, and classroom and behavior management. Coursework and/or inservice training in these areas prior to placement of children with handicaps in regular classes is important if

mainstreaming is to be successful. In a comprehensive review of teacher training literature, Adams, Quintero, Killoran, Striefel, & Frede, (1986) identified 23 competencies for teachers which could facilitate the process of mainstreaming. The competencies could serve as a sound basis for pre-service and inservice teacher training programs.

Teacher Incentives for Mainstreaming

It may be speculated that school districts lack positive consequences for teachers to accept such children. Accordingly, teachers who do not accept these children in their classes do not have to experience negative consequences. A common practice is to identify a receptive teacher in a school, and to repeatedly mainstream students into that teacher's classroom. However, this system can result in overwhelming the once-receptive teacher, and in the view that mainstreaming is the responsibility of some, but not all, educators (Walker, 1983). A great deal of attention has been focused upon child reinforcement techniques, but little has been written about teacher reinforcement. One study specifically recommends additional pay, compensatory time and lower pupil-teacher adult ratios (Quetzloe & Cline, 1983).

Student Characteristics and Teacher Attitudes

A teacher's positive attitude and feelings of success in his/her work have been linked to the academic progress demonstrated by that teacher's students (Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). Since the educational progress of children with handicaps is usually slower than the progress made by nonhandicapped peers, a teacher who lacks experience in working with children who have handicaps and who lacks the skills necessary

for monitoring the progress made by a child with handicaps may feel discouraged with a child's slow progress (Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). The study described previously in which placement of a child with emotional disturbance was preceded by intervention strategies including teacher training by special educators, school psychologists, and counselors in the application of behavior modification techniques with contingent reinforcement, demonstrates how as the student began to exhibit positive behavior change, the teacher's comments also began to reflect a positive trend. This implies, and is supported in the literature, that teacher attitudes are more positive toward those students with whom they experience success (Hersh & Walker, 1983; Morgan & Thompson, 1980; Salend & Johns, 1983; Schleifer & Klein, 1978). Furthermore, when a mainstreamed student was perceived by teachers as demonstrating success, teachers expressed disinterest in referring the student for placement in a special education class. They encouraged continued placement in the mainstream, and they described the student with handicaps as having needs which were within the normal range for the class.

Student achievement also determines the attention which a student receives from the teacher (Alexander & Strain, 1978; Brophy & Good, 1984; Hersch & Walker, 1983; Thompson & Morgan, 1980). Teachers direct greater attention to high achievers, and they direct less attention to low achieving students. A child with handicaps functioning at a delay of two years in contrast with nonhandicapped peers is likely to receive the same decreased amount of attention as the low achiever, even when attention is given, it is likely to be negative in nature (Brophy & Good, 1974; Thompson & Morgan,

(1980). Thompson and Morgan (1980), using the Brophy-Good Teacher-Child Dyadic Interaction system (1974), found that teachers initiated higher rates of interaction with students with behavioral handicaps than with groups of high and low achieving nonhandicapped and students with learning disabilities however, although the students with behavioral handicaps received more teacher feedback, the majority of this feedback involved observations and reprimands for inappropriate behavior. Interestingly, a teacher who attends more often to inappropriate behaviors can inadvertently increase these behaviors through selective attention to them (Barkley, 1981). For this reason, Thompson and Morgan support the need for teacher training in behavior management techniques to instruct teachers on the use of attention for appropriate desirable classroom behaviors.

A converse situation may also pose problems in a mainstreaming setting: children with handicaps may receive preferential treatment in the mainstreaming classroom. This situation leads to the concern expressed by some parents of nonhandicapped children that there will be a reduction in time and attention their children will receive if children with handicaps are present in the same class (Bloom & Gargunkel, 1981; Demerest & Vuoulo, 1983; Karnes, 1980; Schmalz, 1982; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1983).

In summary, the slow progress and behavior deficits which are characteristic of students with handicaps can negatively affect teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming. To counter this situation teachers need to be trained in specific teaching techniques, data collection to monitor student progress, and observations of a student's achievements that teachers can experience their students' success, and feel competent in knowing how and when to respond to a student's needs.

Support Services & Technical Assistance

The amount of support services and technical assistance which are available to a regular classroom teacher are major factors contributing to positive teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming and children with handicaps (Cohen, 1977; Donaldson, 1980; Hannah & Pilner, 1983; Larrivee, 1981; Lombardi, Meadowcroft, & Strausburger, 1982 Rule, Killoran, & Striefel et al., 1982). Support services include the availability of special educators, psychologists, and other specialists to provide the regular classroom teacher with needed consultation and suggestions for teaching the mainstreamed child. Technical assistance can take the form of coursework, inservice workshops, conferences, and discussion groups. However, it becomes critical to be able to accurately determine specific areas in which teachers need technical assistance in working with children who have handicaps.

The need to assess teacher expectations of the mainstreamed child has been addressed by Walker and colleagues (1983) through the development of the Social Behavior Survival Program (SBS). This program enables one to assess the social and behavioral expectations that regular teachers may have for students with behavioral handicaps. As the authors point out (Walker & Rankin, 1982), the greatest reason for failure of students with mild or moderate handicaps in a mainstream environment is typically the exhibition of inappropriate classroom behaviors (i.e. noncompliance, self-abuse, physical aggression). Teacher's failure to deal with such behaviors appropriately also contribute to the failure of the child with handicaps in the mainstream. However, it does not appear to necessarily follow that the success of a student with handicaps in a mainstream environment will be

determined solely by appropriate social classroom behavior. Students with deficits in self-help, cognitive and communication skills are also greatly disadvantaged in a regular classroom when a teacher is not prepared to manage these deficits. In order to address these areas, the Mainstream Expectation and Needs Assessment (MESA) for school-age and for preschool and kindergarten children (MESA-PK) were developed (Striefel, Killoran & Quintero, 1985; Striefel, Killoran & Quintero, 1986). These instruments were designed to provide a receiving teacher with the opportunity to indicate what child skill deficits would be problematic in the receiving class, and for which of these deficit areas the teacher would need technical assistance and/or support services. This information can be used to: (1) provide necessary services to the teacher, (2) train the child in critical deficit areas, and (3) provide information on what skills other students will need to learn in order to be mainstreamed successfully. Research with these instruments is currently being conducted to determine their effectiveness in addressing these areas.

In summary, it is recommended that instruments for assessing teacher expectations in areas related to mainstreaming be developed and that the skill levels of the child with handicaps be assessed thoroughly in the same areas. A procedure for matching the child's skill level to a teacher's expectations is a critical need if mainstreaming of children with handicaps into the regular classroom is to be successful.

REFERENCES

Alexander, C., & Strain, P. S. (1978). A review of educator's attitudes toward handicapped children and the concept of mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 15(3), 48-53.

Algozinne, R., Whorton, J., & Reid, W. (1979). Special class exit criteria: A modest beginning. Journal of Special Education, 13(2), 131-136.

Aloia, G. F., & Aloia, S. D. (1982). Teacher expectation questionnaire: A scale to help determine the most appropriate placement for the mainstreamed handicapped student. Journal for Special Educators, 19(2), 11-20.

Antonak, R. F. (1980). A hierarchy of attitudes toward exceptionality. The Journal of Special Education, 14(2), 231-241.

Barkley, R. A. (1981). Hyperactive children: A Handbook for diagnosis and treatment. New York: Guilford Press.

Brophy, J.E., & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for childrens classroom performance: some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 365-374.

Brophy, J.E. & Good, T. L. (1974). Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Brophy, J.E. & Everton, C. (1981). Student characteristics and teaching. New York: Longman.

Childs, R. (1981). Perceptions of mainstreaming by regular classroom teachers who teach mainstreamed educable mentally retarded students in the public schools. **Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 16,** 225-227.

Cohen, S. (1977). Improving attitudes toward the handicapped. In H. J. Burback (Ed.) Mainstreamings: A book of readings and resources for the classroom teacher, (pp. 54-61). Bubuque, Iowa. Kendall/Hant.

Cirsci, P. E. (1981). Competencies for mainstreaming: Problems and issues. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 175-182.

Donaldson, J. (1980). Changing attitudes toward handicapped persons: A review and analysis of research. Exceptional Children, 46(7), 504-514.

Forness, S. (1980). A transition model for placement of handicapped children in regular and special classes. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 3, 37-49.

FSM/VSSM (August 1985). Definitions of Mainstreaming.

Gajar, A. (1983). The relevance of problems encountered in attitudinal research: a personal perspective. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16, 586-587.

Green, K., Rock, D., & Weisenstein, G. (1983). Validity and reliability of a scale assessing attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 50, 182-183.

Guralnick, M.J. (1981). Programmatic factors affecting child-child social interactions in mainstreamed pre-school programs. Exceptional Child Quarterly, 1(4), 74-91.

Hannah, M.E., & Pilner, S. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children: A review and synthesis. School Psychology Review, 12, 12-25.

Hersch, R. H., & Walker, H. M. (1983). Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. Policy Studies Review, 2(1).

Johnson, A. B., & Cartwright, C. A. (1979). The roles of information and experience in improving teachers' knowledge and attitudes about mainstreaming. The Jounral of Special Education. 13(4), 453-462.

Jones, R. L., Jamieson, J., Moulin, L., & Towner, A. C. (1981). Attitudes and mainstreaming: theoretical perspectives and review of research. In P. Bates (Ed.), Mainstreaming: Our Current Knowledge Base (pp. 52-82). Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Kauffman, J., & Hallshan, D. (Eds.). (1981). Handbook of Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Larrivee, B. (1981). Effect of inservice training intensity on teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48(1), 34-40.

Larrivee B. (1982). Factors underlying regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 374-379.

Lombardi, T., Meadowcroft, P., & Strasburger, R. (1982). Modifying teacher trainers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48(6), 544-545.

McEvoy, M.A., Nordquist, V. M., & Cunningham, T. L. (1984). Regular and special education teachers' judgments about mentally retarded children in an integrated setting. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 89(2), 167-173.

Naor, M., & Milgram, R. M. (1980). Two preservice strategies for preparing regular class teachers for mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 47(2), 126-129.

Raver, S. A. (1980). Ten rules for success in preschool mainstreaming. Education Unlimited, 2, 47-52.

Reynolds, B. J., Martin-Reynolds, J., & Mark, F D. (1982). Elementary teachers: Attitudes toward mainstreaming educable mentally retarded. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 17(3), 171-176.

Rule, S., Killoran, J., Stowitschek, J., Innocenti, M., Striefel, S., Boswell, C. (January 1984). Training materials and support: factors related to teachers attitudes toward mainstreaming. Unpublished manuscript submitted to Exceptional Children.

Salend, S., & Jones, J. (1983). A tale of two teachers: Changing teacher commitment to mainstreaming. Teaching Exceptional Children, 15(2), 82-85.

Schranzer, S. S. (1981). When can we justify mainstreaming? Principal, 61, 31-32.

Schleifer, M.J., & Klein, S.D. (1978). The teacher and mainstreaming. The Exceptional Parent, pp. 53-56.

Schmelkin, L. (1981). Teachers' and nonteachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48(1), 42-47.

Schwartz, L. L. (1984). Exceptional Students in the Mainstream. Belmont California: Wadworth Publishing Company.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S.s (1982). Preparing regular class teachers for the integration of severely retarded students. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 17(4), 273-277.

Stephens, T. M., & Braun, B.L. (1980). Measures of regular classroom teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 46(4), 292-294.

Taylor, S. J. (1982). From segregation to integration: Strategies for integrating severely handicapped students in normal school and community settings. The Association of the Severely Handicapped Journal, 8, 42-49.

Taylor, R. L., Smiley, L. R., & Zeigler, E. W. (1983). The effects of labels and assigned attributes on teacher perceptions of academic and social behavior. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded. , 45-51.

Thompson, R. H., & Morgan, D. P. (1980). Interaction patterns of regular classroom teachers with mildly handicapped students in mainstreamed classrooms. (Tech. Rep. No. 47).

Walker, H. M., & Rankin, R., (1980). The SBS Checklist: Correlates of child handicapping conditions. Available from the Center on Human Development, Clinical Services Building, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, 97403.

Walker, H. M., McConnell, S., Walker, J.L. Clarke, J.Y., Todis, B., Cohen, G., & Rankin, R. (1983). Initial analysis of the accepts curriculum: Efficacy of instructional and behavioral management procedures for improving the social adjustment of handicapped children. Analysis and intervention in development disabilities, 3, 105-127.

Walker, H.M., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations demands of less restrictive settings. School Psychology Review, 12, 274-284.

Warger, C.L., & Trippe M. (1982). Preservice teacher attitudes toward mainstreamed students with emotional impairments. Exceptional Children, 49(3), 246-252.